



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|----------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/571,872 | 09/20/2006 | Kihak Shim | 5835-000004/US/NP | 6894 |
| 27572 | 7590 | 12/21/2007 | EXAMINER | |
| HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C. | | | LIM, SENG HENG | |
| P.O. BOX 828 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303 | | | 3714 | |
| MAIL DATE | | DELIVERY MODE | | |
| 12/21/2007 | | PAPER | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/571,872 | SHIM, KIHAK | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Seng H. Lim | 3714 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 March 2006.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/15/06.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kato et al (US 2003/0132665 A1) taken with Gazzard (US 2004/0037239 A1).

Regarding claims 1-4,10-14: Kato et al discloses a cellular phone comprising a program memory unit for storing a complier (Fig.2:22,23,24); a parameter storage unit for use in performing a data communication (claim 14); a key input unit including at least one key button (Fig.1); an electronic compass module incorporating a magnetic sensor for outputting a sensor output signal proportional to magnitude of the external geomagnetic field which varies with an upward, a downward, a leftward and a rightward motion of the mobile communication terminal, for outputting a horizontal or a vertical rotation angle value [0022]; a microprocessor (Fig.2:21); a liquid crystal display unit (Fig.2:14) and a speaker (Fig.2:13)

Kato et al does not specifically disclose the cellular phone comprising a wireless Internet browser using WAP, a subscriber identity module (SIM) and ITU defining the communication systems; however, the Office takes Official Notice that providing a wireless Internet browser using WAP, SIM and ITU defining the communication systems is notoriously well known and practiced in the cellular phone industry as evidence by Gazzard and would have been motivated to do so to provide users with more features and reasons for using the device.

Regarding claims 5, 7-9: Kato et al discloses the module to include an AD converter connected to an X-axis magnetic sensor and a Y-axis magnetic sensor of the magnetic sensor unit. The AD converter converts analog output values of the X-axis magnetic sensor and the Y-axis sensor to digital values and supplies the digital values to the CPU [0079]. The angles are defined between 0-360 degrees, hence, a compensation processor is inherently incorporated therein a compensation algorithm [0088, 0092].

Regarding claim 6: Kato et al do not disclose supplying a constant DC voltage to the magnetic sensor; however, the Office takes Official Notice that supplying DC voltage to a cellular phone from an automobile is well known and practiced in the art. At the time of invention a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to supply DC voltage to power the cellular phone and would have been motivated to do so to allowing usage of the device in an automobile.

Claims 15-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kato et al (US 2003/0132665 A1).

Kato et al discloses a method comprising the steps of providing a game list to cellular phone, presenting a network mobile game selected by the cellular phone, providing and executing a game mode selection for either an electronic compass mode or key input mode to control the movement of game character [0017, 0101, 0123-0125]. List of games may include a role playing game [0138].

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct

from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Omum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1 & 15 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 & 18 of copending Application No. 10/571,966. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both application claims a method and mobile communication terminal using electronic compass module to control game character's movements.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Please see attached USPTO form PTO-892.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Seng H. Lim whose telephone number is 571-270-3301. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-6:00, Monday-Friday, alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Xuan Thai can be reached on 571-272-7147. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SHL

December 10, 2007

Ronald Laneau
RONALD LANEAU
PRIMARY EXAMINER

12/19/07